

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 10/27/2006

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/813,940	03/30/2004	William I. Chang	M-15350 US	7479
32605 7	590 10/27/2006		EXAM	INER
	ON KWOK CHEN &	BELL, CORY C		
2033 GATEWAY PLACE SUITE 400		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
SAN JOSE, CA 95110			2164	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/813,940	CHANG, WILLIAM I.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Cory C. Bell	2164			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).					
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on					
,	action is non-final.				
· —	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is				
, <u> </u>	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims					
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-26</u> is/are pending in the application.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8) Claim(s) <u>1-26</u> are subject to restriction and/or e	election requirement.	•			
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.				
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acce	epted or b) objected to by the I	Examiner.			
Applicant may not request that any objection to the					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).					
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:					
 Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 					
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No					
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage					
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).					
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.					
Attachment(s)					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)					
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F				
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:				

Application/Control Number: 10/813,940

Art Unit: 2164

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species:

Claims 3 and 16 relate to usage of the present method for debugging, Claims 4 and 17 relate to usage of the present method for performing an audit trail, Claims 5 and 18 relate to usage of the present method for monitoring a manufacturing process, Claims 6 and 19 relate to usage of the present method for monitoring a business process, Claims 7 and 20 relate to usage of the present method for application integration, and Claims 8-9 and 21-22 relate to usage of the present method for using the results in a merger. The species are independent or distinct because they relate to various embodiments in which the user query is use to perform different tasks, that are clearly distinct from one another.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claims 1-2, 10-15, and 23-26 are generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an

Application/Control Number: 10/813,940 Page 3

Art Unit: 2164

allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election,

applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an

election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37

CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve

a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and

specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated

as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably

distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the

inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In

either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the

evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

CHARLES RONES
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER